

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-10, 15, 16, and 18 were pending in the application. Claim 18 is cancelled in this reply without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 20-27 are newly added. Accordingly, claims 1-10, 15, 16, and 20-27 are now pending. Claims 1, 15, 16, and 20 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1 and 20.

Drawings

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner acknowledge the formal drawings filed on November 24, 2003, and indicate whether they are acceptable.

Objection to Specification

Item 9 of the Office Action Summary indicates that the specification is objected to by the Examiner. However, Applicants respectfully note that no objection is addressed within the body of Office Action dated May 13, 2008. If the Examiner intends to object to the specification, please provide a details explanation of the objection to afford the Applicants an opportunity to correct; otherwise, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner please affirmatively indicate that the Examiner has no objection to the specification.

Claim Amendments

By way of this reply, independent claims 1, 15, and 16 are amended to clarify the invention. No new subject matter is introduced by these amendments as support may be found,

for example, in paragraphs [0008], [0020], [0021], [0023]-[0028], and [0030]-[0032] of the instant application. Further, claims 7-9 are amended to correct antecedent basis issues. No new subject matter is introduced by these amendments for simple formality issues.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-10, 15, 16, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the reference entitled “Computer Implemented and/or Assisted Method and System for Facilitating the Licensing of Media Content,” by Christina S. Shutes (hereafter, “Shutes”). Claim 18 is cancelled by this reply. Accordingly, the rejection is now moot with respect to claim 18. For the reasons set forth below, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

For anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or implicitly. Further for a reference to anticipate the invention, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” See MPEP § 2131 citing *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir.1989).

The Examiner contends that Shutes teaches or suggests the invention as recited in the claims. The Applicants respectfully disagree. Specifically, with respect to the amended independent claims 1 and 16, the Applicants respectfully assert that Shutes fails to teach the following limitation:

“receiving a selection of a report template to be used to create a report, wherein the report template includes query parameters, layout information, and content field information.”

The Examiner contends that paragraphs [0060] and [0065] of Shutes teach or suggest the aforementioned limitation. In fact, Applicants assert that the cited portion of Shutes merely provides query information and does *not* extract data using report templates with query parameters. Further, Applicants assert that Shutes fails to teach or suggest “assessing whether the financial data is compatible with the report template by examining a data file type and contents of the financial data” itself. [Emphasis added]. Accordingly, Shutes does not teach the use of report templates in the manner explicitly recited in claims 1 and 16.

Further, with respect to the amended independent claims 15 and 16, Applicants respectfully assert that Shutes fails to teach the following limitation:

“generating a report template by extracting query parameters, content fields, and report layout information from reports and exporting the report template”

The Examiner contends that paragraphs [0050], [0060], [0062], [0065], [0138], [0143], [0169], [0217], [0243], [0248], [0249], [0272], [0294], [0301], [0303], [0304], [0307], [0317], [0319], [0332], [0354], [0355], [0401]-[0424], figure 14, and the abstract of Shutes teaches or suggests the aforementioned limitation. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. In fact, Applicants assert that the cited portion of Shutes do not deal with the process of creating and exporting a report template. In fact, of those paragraphs cited, only paragraphs [0169], [0217], [0243], [0248] and [0272], make mention of creating a report template. However, these cited paragraphs only mention that a user could create a template and do not teach how this could possibly be accomplished. Instead these paragraphs focus on how the template is to be used once created. Accordingly, the cited paragraphs fail to teach the creation and exportation of a report template as explicitly contained in claims 15 and 16.

Thus, the Examiner's contentions do not support the rejection of amended independent claims 1, 15, and 16. Claims 2-10 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1. Thus, the Examiner's contentions also do not support a rejection of claims 2-10. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Newly Added Claims

Claims 20-27 are newly added by this reply. No new subject matter is added by way of these claims as support may be found, for example, in paragraphs [0019], [0023], [0026], [0027], [0030], and [0031] of the instant application. Claim 20 contains essentially the same limitations relied upon above to argue that amended independent claims 1, 15, and 16 are patentable. Accordingly, Shute does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent claim 20 for at least the same reason provided for amended independent claims 1, 15, and 16. Thus, amended independent claim 20 is patentable over Shute. Dependent claims 21-27, which depend directly from claim 20, are patentable over Shute for at least the same reasons.

Conclusion

Applicants believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 37202/127002; 990050).

Dated: October 14, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By /Robert P. Lord/
Robert P. Lord
Registration No.: 46,479
OSHA · LIANG LLP
3945 Freedom Circle, Suite 300
Santa Clara, California 95054
(408) 727-0600
(408) 727-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicants